IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 15TH NOVEMBER 2006 / 24TH KARTHIKA 1928

RP.No. 532 of 2006(W)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.25189/2005
.....

PETITIONER:

P. NOUSHAD, S/O. MOIDEEN,
PARAMBADAN HOUSE, P.O. KARUVAMBRAM,
MANJERI, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.BINOY VASUDEVAN

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,
MALAPPURAM REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

2. THE SECRETARY, REGIONAL TRANSPORT
AUTHORITY, MALAPPURAM.

3. M.P.A. HABEEB RAHMAN KURIKKAL,
THURAKKAL, MANJERI, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

R1, R2 BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT.LAKSHMI RANI
R2 BY ADV.SRI.P.SAMSUDIN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 15/11/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, J

R.P.No.532 OF 2006

Dated this the 15th day of November, 2006

O R D E R

Learned Government Pleader appears for respondents 1 and 2. Adv.Sri.P.Samsudeen appears for R3.

2. Heard. By the judgment sought to be reviewed, certain directions were issued to the STAT regarding the hearing of two appeals. Those directions were issued because this Court had come to the conclusion that there was conflict between two orders passed by the STAT.

3. Learned counsel for the review petitioner (writ petitioner) submits that such conflict was apparently not there because the route in question is a long distant route and therefore, the allotment of two different permits to two different persons would not result in any conflict. Learned Government Pleader submits that if the RTA is directed to consider the matter, as of now, it will only result in confusion.

In the aforesaid circumstance, this review petition is disposed of directing that if the STAT is yet to dispose of M.V.A.A.Nos.420/04 and 431/04, in doing so, the STAT will take note of the aforesaid submission of the review petitioner (writ petitioner) also.

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
Judge

kkb.